

REMARKS

Introduction

Upon entry of the foregoing response, claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1-28 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §101

In a telephone interview with the Examiner on February 5, 2009 (recorded in an Interview Summary dated February 9, 2009), the Examiner amended the original rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and limited that rejection to effect only claims 1-14 and 23, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. The recited features of these claims include structural features (i.e., without limitation, a server and a computer in communication with the server), to more clearly show the interrelationship between the recited method features and the currently recited structural features with which they operate and interrelate.

Therefore, in view of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 23, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of independent claim 1, and claims 2-14 which depend therefrom, and independent claim 23, and submits that all of these currently recited claims 1-14 and 23 are directed to statutory subject matter.

Rejection under 35 USC §112

Independent claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 28 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. Support for the amendment of claim 28 is found in the specification at, for example, the last paragraph of page

15 through the top paragraph of page 16 of the specification. In view of the amendment of claim 28, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection and submits that as currently recited, claim 28 is directed to subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-20, 21, 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over International Publication No. WO 98/42173 to Lahti et al. (hereinafter "Lahti") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0019487 to Kleindienst et al. (hereinafter "Kleindienst"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 21 and 22 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. The following features, among others, are currently recited in amended independent claims 1, 21 and 22:

Lahti is directed to a method to perform banking services using a digital cellular radio system to transfer SMS type messages between a bank and a user of the digital cellular radio system. (See, for example, the Abstract, Fig. 1 and Pgs. 2 and 3 of Lahti)

Kleindienst is directed to multi-modal messaging such that a user can use one or more modalities of input (e.g., speech, GUI) to enter a SMS message. (See, for example, the Abstract and Par. [0009] of Kleindienst)

However, neither recited reference, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, without limitation, all of the following currently recited features of these independent claims:

- a "message composing wizard" which is accessed by the GUI such that the SMS MCW retrieves a SMS universal encoding template (SMS UET) which includes pre-defined data parameters for existing categorizations (types) of SMS business messages to automatically facilitate the preparation of the new SMS business message by the business user such that the business user selects, using the SMS MCW, an existing type of SMS business message format defined by the SMS UET and then enters data at the GUI based on pre-defined data parameters for the existing selected type of SMS business message format to automatically prepare the new SMS business messages,

Serial No.: 10/529,988
Docket No.: CA920020072US1
Reply to the Office Action of January 7, 2009

- validating, by the server, data retrieved by a server data collection interface by comparing the data entered at the GUI to the SMS UET which has been retrieved by the server, to ensure that there are no data parameter errors and to ensure that the new SMS business message is properly formatted for the selected type of SMS business message format,

- receiving from the mobile recipient an incoming SMS message in response to the SMS MI that was transmitted by the server to the mobile recipient such that an inbound template identification (ID) is extracted from the incoming SMS message by a runtime processor of the server,

- parsing, by the server runtime processor, the incoming SMS message to decode data of the incoming SMS message using an inbound template retrieved by the runtime processor from an inbound template database based on the extracted inbound template ID, such that the retrieved inbound template is associated with the selected type of SMS business message format of the SMS MI that was sent to the mobile recipient, and

- routing, by the server, the decoded data of the incoming SMS message to a software application disposed in the server for processing of the decoded data under control of the software application,

as these features are currently recited in these independent claims 1, 21 and 22.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above regarding amended independent claims 1, 21 and 22, there is no disclosure or teaching in Lahti or Kleindienst of all of the currently recited features of these independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of amended independent claims 1, 21 and 22 is earnestly solicited.

Dependent claims 2-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahti in view of Kleindienst. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Regarding dependent claims 2-19, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 1, they include at least all of the features of amended independent claim 1, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding amended independent claim 1, there is no disclosure or teaching in Lahti or Kleindienst, separately or in combination, of all of the features of these dependent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 2-19 are patentably distinguishable over Lahti and Kleindienst. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested

that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of dependent claims 2-19 is earnestly solicited.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

Claims 23, 24-27, 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahti. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 23, 24 and 28 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. However Lahti does not disclose, without limitation, all of the following currently recited features for each respective claim:

Claim 23: receiving from a mobile recipient an incoming SMS message in response to an SMS business message instance (SMS MI) that was automatically prepared by a business user using a SMS message composing wizard (SMS MCW) and which was transmitted by a server to the mobile recipient such that an inbound template identification (ID) is extracted from the incoming SMS message by a runtime processor of the server,

parsing, by the server runtime processor, the incoming SMS message to decode data of the incoming SMS message using an inbound template retrieved by the runtime processor from an inbound template database based on the extracted inbound template ID, such that the retrieved inbound template is associated with a type of SMS business message format previously selected by a business user and associated with the SMS MI that was sent to the mobile recipient, and

routing, by the server, the decoded data of the incoming SMS message to a software application disposed in the server for processing of the decoded data under control of the software application.

Claim 24: each field and indicator label of a SMS commerce format of a commerce message is automatically filled in with data input on a graphic user interface of a computer by a business user utilizing a SMS message composing wizard (SMS MCW) disposed in the computer and accessed by the GUI and which retrieves a SMS universal encoding template (SMS UET) which includes pre-defined data parameters for existing categorizations (types) of SMS business message formats to automatically facilitate the filling in of said data into said fields and said indicator labels corresponding to an existing type of SMS business message format which is selected by the business user as said SMS commerce message format.

Serial No.: 10/529,988
Docket No.: CA920020072US1
Reply to the Office Action of January 7, 2009

Claim 28: preparing, by a business user, new SMS business messages to be sent to a mobile recipient such that the business user uses a graphic user interface (GUI) of a computer to invoke a SMS message composing wizard (SMS MCW) which is accessed by the GUI such that the SMS MCW retrieves a SMS universal encoding template (SMS UET) which includes pre-defined data parameters for existing categorizations (types) of SMS business messages to automatically facilitate the preparation of the new SMS business messages by the business user such that the business user selects, using the SMS MCW, for each new SMS business message to be prepared, an existing type of SMS business message format defined by the SMS UET and then enters data at the GUI based on pre-defined data parameters for the selected type of SMS business message format to automatically prepare the new SMS business messages,

retrieving, by a data collection interface (DCI) of a server which is in communication with the computer, the data entered at the GUI of the computer by the business user to prepare the new SMS business messages,

validating, by the server, the data retrieved by the server DCI by comparing the data entered at the GUI to the SMS UET, which has been retrieved by the server, to ensure that there are no data parameter errors and to ensure that the new SMS business messages are properly formatted for the selected type(s) of SMS business message format(s),

generating for each new SMS business message, by the server, a SMS message instance (SMS MI) which is categorized based on the type of SMS business message format(s) selected by the business user, and

transmitting, by the server, each SMS MI to a wireless gateway for delivery of each SMS MI to a mobile recipient, wherein categorization meta data defining the selected type(s) of said outbound prepare new SMS messages such that said commerce categorization (type) of said outbound SMS messages represents a specific intended business usage of each outbound SMS message, wherein said categorization meta data provides definitions of each of said SMS messages and instructions that are parsable into semantic information used by said data processing system to encode and generate each said SMS MI for corresponding to said SMS business messages.

Dependent claims 25-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahti.

Regarding dependent claims 25-27, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 24, they include at least all of the features of amended independent claim 24, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding amended independent claim 24, there is no disclosure in Lahti of all of the features of these dependent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 25-27 are patentably distinguishable over Lahti, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of dependent claims 25-27 is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/529,988
Docket No.: CA920020072US1
Reply to the Office Action of January 7, 2009

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

DILLON & YUDELL, LLP

Dated: April 6, 2009
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759
Telephone: (512) 343-6116

By: /Eustace P. Isidore/
Eustace P. Isidore
Registration No. 56,104